



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/022,443

12/20/2001

Randal L. Dunn

95-474

5112

23164

7590

12/14/2006

LEON R TURKEVICH

2000 M STREET NW

7TH FLOOR

WASHINGTON, DC 200363307

EXAMINER

HAILE, FEBEN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2616

DATE MAILED: 12/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/022,443

Applicant(s)

DUNN ET AL.

Examiner

Feben M. Haile

Art Unit

2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 October 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-11,15-21,25-31 and 35-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2-4, 12-14, 22-24, and 32-24 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

1. In view of applicant's amendment filed October 02, 2006, the status of the application is still pending with respect to claims 1-40.

2. The amendment filed is insufficient to overcome the rejection of the claims based upon Prasad et al. (US 2003/0016684) as set forth in the last Office action because: the material added to the claims fail to further clarify a distinction between the Applicants invention and the cited reference, thus the subject matter is not patentable.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claim 1, 11, 21, and 31 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prasad et al. (US 2003/0016684), hereinafter referred to as Prasad.

**Regarding claims 1, 11, 21, and 31,** Prasad discloses a routing table configured for storing message class entries identifying respective message classes, each message class entry specifying at least one destination link identifier for a corresponding destination link assigned to the corresponding message class (**figure 4 unit 210, figure 5, and page 3 paragraph 0033; a routing table stores point codes, i.e. routing codes, for specifying destination nodes and routing contexts); and a**

Art Unit: 2616

processor configured for selecting one of the destination links based on the processor classifying the received signaling message as assigned to the corresponding message class based on prescribed message class selection criteria (**figure 4 unit 200 and page 2 paragraph 0030; a processor reviews the routing table to determine the routing context associated with the routing code**), the processor configured for selecting one of the message class entries based on determining the corresponding identified message class matches the specific message class of the received signaling message, the one message class entry specifying the corresponding destination link identifier for the one destination link (**page 3 paragraph 0031; executing a transmission process according to the routing context and routing code**).

Prasad fails to explicitly suggest message classes.

However Prasad teaches routing contexts for the management of SS7 signals, as the Examiner interprets the claims in their broadest sense, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to realize that the "routing context" taught by Prasad could read on the "message class" disclosed by the Applicant because both are used for the organization of signaling messages into categories for treatment.

4. Claims 5-7, 15-17, 25-27, and 35-37 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prasad et al. (US 2003/0016684), hereinafter referred to as Prasad, in view of Jeong (US 5912,628), hereinafter referred to as Jeong.

**Regarding claims 5, 15, 25, and 35**, Prasad discloses the limitations of the base claims. Prasad further teaches a plurality of linkset interfaces configured for receiving

Art Unit: 2616

signaling messages from respective input linksets (**figure 2 links A, B, & C and figure 4 units 120, 130, & 140**).

Prasad fails to disclose the prescribed message class selection criteria including classifying the received signaling message based on identifying one of a plurality of input linksets having supplied the received signaling message.

Jeong teaches transmitting signal messages over links where a criterion classifies the links into two types, i.e. 0 or 1, where the signal message contains a SLS value equivalent to the binary code of the selected link and classifying the message as belonging to one of the links according to that value (**column 3 lines 12-17**). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill that one could identify the link that supplied the signal message using the SLS value.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of classifying a message taught by Jeong into the processor of the signal transfer point disclosed by Prasad. The motivation for such a modification is an improved method of selecting a link for the transmission of a signal message.

**Regarding claims 6, 16, 26, and 36**, Prasad discloses the limitations of the base claims.

Prasad fails to teach wherein the prescribed message class selection criteria including classifying the received signaling message based on prescribed user-selected selection criteria.

Jeong discloses a method of transmitting a signal message where a link for transmission is selected using a criterion that classifies the message into two types **(column 3 lines 12-17)**.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of classifying a message taught by Jeong into the processor of the signal transfer point disclosed by Prasad. The motivation for such a modification is an improved method of selecting a link for the transmission of a signal message.

Regarding claims 7, 17, 27, and 37, Prasad discloses the limitations of the base claims.

Prasad fails to teach wherein the user-selected selection criteria include a user-selected data pattern.

Jeong discloses the criterion used for classifying a signal message is obtained by dividing a value contained in the signal message by two, wherein the value is the decimal equivalent of the binary code for the signal message **(column 3 lines 12-17)**.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of classifying a message taught by Jeong into the processor of the signal transfer point disclosed by Prasad. The motivation for such a modification is an improved method of selecting a link for the transmission of a signal message.

5. Claims 8, 18, 28 and 38 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prasad et al. (US 2003/0016684), hereinafter referred to as Prasad, in view of Allison et al. (US 2004/0081206), hereinafter referred to as Allison.

**Regarding claims 8, 18, 28, and 38**, Prasad discloses the limitations of the base claims.

Prasad fails to teach wherein the prescribed message class selection criteria include classifying the received signaling message based on a service indicator value from the received signaling message.

Allison discloses a signaling gateway routing node that includes a discrimination function that examines a service indicator parameter in the received message to determine the type of message (**page 4 column 0034**).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of the discrimination function taught by Allison into the processor of the signal transfer point disclosed by Prasad. The motivation for such a modification is an improved for service selection in a telecommunications signaling network.

6. Claims 9-10, 19-20, 29-30, and 39-40 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prasad et al. (US 2003/0016684), hereinafter referred to as Prasad, in view of Lee (US 2001/0008532), hereinafter referred to as Lee.

**Regarding claims 9, 19, 29, and 39**, Prasad discloses the limitations of the base claims.

Prasad fails to teach wherein the prescribed message class selection criteria include classifying the received signaling message based on global title translation (GTT) parameters retrieved from the received signaling message.

Lee discloses a No. 7 gateway that provides global title translation services represented by unique numbers (**page 1 paragraph 0006**) where these services are classified according to these values (**page 1 paragraph 0007**).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of the No. 7 gateway taught by Lee into the processor of the signal transfer point disclosed by Prasad. The motivation for such a modification is an improved method of a mapping function for different translation types in a No. 7 gateway signaling network.

**Regarding claims 10, 20, 30, and 40,** Prasad discloses the limitations of the base claims.

Prasad fails to teach wherein the prescribed message class selection criteria include classifying the received message based on a Global Title Address (GTA) from the GTT parameters.

Lee discloses that unique numbers represent global title translation services for classification purposes (**page paragraph 0006-0007**). As the Examiner interprets the claims in their broadest sense, the "unique numbers" taught by Lee could read on the "GTA" disclosed by the Applicant.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of the No. 7 gateway taught by Lee into



Art Unit: 2616

the processor of the signal transfer point disclosed by Prasad. The motivation for such a modification being an improved method of a mapping function for different translation types in a No. 7 gateway signaling network.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

7. Claims 2-4, 12-14, 22-24, and 32-34 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments filed October 02, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant respectfully traverses Prasad provides no disclosure for ***classifying*** the received signaling message based on prescribed message selection class criteria and then selecting a message class entry based on the corresponding identified message class ***matching the specific message class***. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant. On page 8 lines 15-17, the Applicant discloses the use of destination information for classification purposes. Prasad teaches determining **(classifying)** a routing context **(message class)** for a SS7 signal **(signaling message)** using a routing table **(prescribed message selection class criteria)** by associating **(matching)** them with corresponding routing codes **(destinations)** specified by the signal and then executing a transmission process accordingly. Therefore as the claims are interpreted in their broadest sense, the Examiner believes that Prasad does disclose the Applicant's invention.

**Conclusion**

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Feben M. Haile whose telephone number is (571) 272-3072. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:00am - 3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ricky Ngo can be reached on (571) 272-3139. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HL  
12/07/2006



WING CHAN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER